DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 921 RC 009 064

AUTHOR Muse, Ivan D.; And Others

TITLE A Study of Rural Teachers and the Rural Schools as

Perceived by School Administrators, Teachers, Parents

and Students.

PUB DATE Oct 75

NOTE 55p.; Recipient of First Annual Award for Outstanding

Research in Rural Education by the Rural Education

Association

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Comparative Analysis;

*Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary

Education; *Parent Attitudes; *Rural Schools; Social Adjustment: *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes;

Teacher Qualifications

IDENTIFIERS *Utah (Northeast)

ABSTRACT

Study objectives were to: (1) generate comparative attitudinal profiles of rural administrators (n=32), teachers (n=77), students (n=290), and parents (n=121) from Northeastern Utah school districts (10 elementary and/or secondary schools); (2) isolate attitudes/factors contributing to turnover and other rural education problems; (3) establish a data bank; (4) indicate directions to alleviate educational problems. Attitudes relative to the following were surveyed: (1) income; (2) cultural deprivation; (3) liberal vs conservative feelings; (4) rationale for teaching in rural schools; (5) the "most difficult adjustment" for new teachers; (6) teacher satisfaction with social life; (7) teacher acceptance; (8) use of rural positions as springboards to better jobs; (9) minority groups; (10) the need for rural teachers to "moonlight"; (11) teachers' expectations of students: (12) parents expectations of teachers; (13) school discipline; (14) importance of the teaching profession; (15) handicapped students; (16) rural/urban student competition; (17) teacher quality; (18) rural teachers language; (19) guidance and counseling for teachers and students; (20) rural teachers work week; (21) traditional vs innovative teachers. It was determined that turnover resulted from teachers accepting a position because it was the only one available or because there was a better position elsewhere. (JC)

A STUDY OF RURAL TEACHERS AND THE RURAL SCHOOLS AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, PARENTS AND STUDENTS

U S OEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EOUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EOUCATION

THIS OOCUMENT HAS BEEN RCPROOUCEO EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN.
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATEO DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EOUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Dr. Ivan D. Muse

and

Dr. Robert J. Parsons

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

and

Mr. Edward W. Hoppe

October 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
METHODOLOGY
The Sample Interviews Reliability and Precision Statistical Analysis
FINDINGS
Income Cultural Deprivation Liberal vs. Conservative Feelings Why Teach in Rural Schools? The Most Difficult Adjustment A Satisfying Social Life? Social Acceptance of Rural Teachers The "Springboard" Hypothesis Minority Groups The "Moonlighting" Hypothesis Do Rural Teachers Expect Too Much from Students? Do Rural Parents Expect Too Much from Teachers? Are Schools Too Strict? How Important is the Teaching Profession? The Handicapped Student in a Rural School Can Rural Students Compete with Urban Students? Are Rural Teachers Adequately Trained? Language Used by Rural Teachers Guidance and Counseling for Students and Teachers The Rural Teacher's Work Week Traditional or Innovative Teachers? Some Additional Findings from Rural Teachers
SUMMARY
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS
APPENDIX
Interpreting Frequency Distributions and Cross Tabulations Questionnaire



This document was given the First Annual Award for Outstanding Research in Rural Education by the Rural Education Association. This award was given at the National Rural Education Conference in San Antonio, Texas, October 1975.

INTRODUCTION

At the event of the founding of this nation Americans were primarily an agricultural and rural people. Census records of the eighteenth century list approximately nineteen of every twenty families in a rural setting. So embued was the population with agricultural and rural fundamentalism that during the nation's battles of the eighteenth century plans for waging war often had to be developed around the planting and harvesting seasons. Although large cities were developing during this century many of the ideas, values, and aspirations of the American people were shaped under these rural conditions.

As the force of industrialism began to be felt in the country rapid changes in rural society took effect. Mechanized factories required workers and the manpower needed was on the farm. Poorer families or tenants quickly realized the value in leaving the country and moving into the city. Jobs were available, the pay was better, and the services (schooling, medical, social, etc.) were far superior to the non-metropolitan area.

As the cities grew the rural areas decreased in population and what had once been considered to be the "best way of living in America" became, as referred to by many, the most disadvantaged. Although not true in all cases, rural areas typically have high percentages of poverty, poorer housing standards, less opportunity for adequate medical care, fewer cultural attractions, and the lowest levels of education. Depopulation of rural areas was more intense after World War II creating severe problems for all rural institutions.

The rural schools were seriously affected by the conditions in rural America. Moe and Tamblyn¹ reported that the:



"Basic questions of the functions of schools, of their goals, of the roles they were to take, of what they were to teach, of size and scale, of costs, and of support had to be rethought."

Many of the redistricting and consolidation of schools have occurred in rural communities and serve as one way in which states attempted to improve education. Increasing amounts of funds from federal programs have also reduced some of the inequity occurring between metropolitan and rural areas although the disparity remains sizeable.²

Since World War II education has been considered by many to be good if it were similar for all. The basic feeling was that the principles of good teaching (content knowledge, management concepts, instructional techniques) are general and have common applicability. Fortunately, a few years ago large city school educators spoke vocally against that point of view. Ghetto children need teachers and programs that are much different from those found in suburban areas. Rural education, likewise, may speak with authority for its point of view. Dawson³ points out:

"...rural children and youth have unique experiences and environmental influences, it must be granted that the education of rural children and youth presents unique and identifiable problems,"

The range of conditions in rural areas such as low density, limited resources, social pecularities, and frequent heavy concentrations of Indian, Black, and Spanish people also add to the distinctiveness of the communities and difficulty in the schools.

Educators in Utah have noted over a period of years that the rate of teacher turnover in rural schools is much higher than in urban schools. This characteristic of rural schools in general is noted by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory who list five primary problems associated



with small schools:4

- 1. Poor quality of instruction
- 2. Difficulty in hiring/retaining "godd teachers"
- 3. Limited course offerings
- 4. Limited equipment
- 5. Inadequate career counseling

Likewise teacher training institutions have not devoted adequate attention to this problem by promoting educational programs that encourage, train, and prepare teachers for life in rural communities. A recent study of university course offerings revelealed that in 1969 no more than six universities in the nation offered courses which might be of any prospective value specifically to the rural teacher. The majority of teacher trainers in the country receive their training in urban centers. The prospective teachers graduating from institutions that are located in metropolitan areas emerge chiefly oriented to life and teaching in the urban setting. As a result many new teachers who might be interested in teaching in rural schools lack understanding of the rural community as well as experience training to determine ability to adapt to the rural setting.

In response to the problem, Brigham Young University, the State Educational Agency, and mine county superintendents have joined together in a consortium of educators to assist in the reduction of teacher turnover and to improve teacher training. Two rural teacher training centers have been placed into operation as a result of the consortium's effort.

In development of the training program the members of the consortium needed to know how parents, teachers, and students in rural areas felt about the many facets of rural education and to what degree these feeling might influence teacher morale, sense of well-being, turnover rates, and other problems. A study of the attitudes of rural administrators, teachers, students and parents relative to educational values was conducted to provide



information for later program development. The overall goals of the study were:

- 1. To generate attitudinal "profiles" of educators, parents, and students about rural teaching and teachers.
- To isolate attitudes and other factors which may be contributing to the turnover rate specifically and other rural education problems generally.
- 3. To compare the attitude profiles of educators with those of parents and students to determine possible sources of discord.
- 4. To establish a bank of data from which meaningful information may be retrieved.
- 5. On the basis of the findings, to indicate some directions which may be considered for the ultimate alleviation of the turnover rate problem and other rural education problems.



METHODOLOGY

The Sample

Several populations were defined for study in the rural community.

Among these were:

- 1. Full-time administrators in Northeastern Utah school districts.
- Full-time teachers in Northeastern Utah school districts.
- 3. Elementary, junior high school, and high school students in Northeastern Utah school districts.
- 4. Parents of students in Northeastern Utah school districts.

The school districts were selected for study in consultation with the Northeastern Utah Educational Service Center. This center provides educational specialists and instructional support to nine county school districts in northeastern Utah. For acceptable levels of reliability and precision, the following sample was drawn from an elementary, junior high, or high school in each of the districts selected for study:

- 1. All available administrators in the district.
- A minimum of five teachers in the district.
- 3. A minimum of twenty-five students.
- 4. A minimum of ten parents.

Increasing the sample size would not have been feasable due to the distances to drive from school to school and the added costs.



When the survey was conducted, the following sample was actually drawn:

32 administrators

77 teachers

290 students

121 parents

520 SAMPLE SIZE (TOTAL)

The sample was taken from the following ten schools located in Northeastern Utah school districts:

- 1. Union High School
- 2. Roosevelt West Junior High
- 3. Duchesne Elementary School
- 4. Vernal Junior High
- 5. Morgan Elementary
- 6. Wasatch High School
- 7. Coalville Elementary
- 8. Park City High School
- 9. Summit High School
- 10. Randolph School

It should be noted from the sample actually drawn that all of the original specifications were either met or exceeded, and that there was no significant variation in the sample drawn from any single school.

Interviews:

The questionnaire was administered by a standard procedure which was developed as the questionnaire was pretested. The administered self-report method was used--which permits many of the advantages of a face-to-face interview, but permits the respondent to retain his privacy in filling out the questionniare. All questions were answered by the respondents and read to the respondents if necessary, to insure as much accuracy in understanding as possible. In addition, the questionnaire was carefully constructed and presented to insure that it would be read and understood with a minimum of variation in comprehension.



The sample was actually drawn by the principal of the school in each location. In most cases the questionnaire was administered to the students separately from the rest of the sample. In the high schools, however, the questionnaire was administered in a single session to the sample. A pre-test had revealed that it was easier to administer the questionnaire to younger students when administered separately.

Reliability and Precision

From the sample size drawn (n = 520) the reliability of the study is estimated as .1. This means that if samples were drawn repeatedly from the population a large number of times, only one sample in ten would be seen to significantly differ from the sample in this study. Obviously the results may only be used as a means of predicting attitudes in the target area. It was felt by the authors that the levels of relativity and precision found in this study were adequate for the type of research attempted.

Statistical Analysis

The authors used the Computer Services at B.Y.U. to perform the statistical computations. The responses to the questionnaire items were first tabulated individually, and then cross-tabulated with each other. The resulting tables were then examined to insure that each cell in the table had a minimum expected value of five responses. Given this criterion, the Pearson Chi-Square statistic was used to assess the interdependence of the variables being compared, and the Contingency Coefficient was computed to determine the significance, or strength, of association. The combination of these two statistics permited the researchers to



determine the degree of variation of one factor as it was influenced by the variation in another factor.

In this study, the statistical process revealed the variation of attitudes among educators, students and parents. In some instances variations were considered when based on other factors such as sex, marital status, length of residence, etc.

FINDINGS

Income

In rating their own family income the subjects responded as expected. The majority of administrators rate themselves as having income higher than most families, but with significant numbers rating themselves both higher and lower. Parents rate themselves as about the same as other families with a significant percentage as higher than most families. Relatively few parents viewed themselves with low incomes.

When responding to comparing the teachers' income generally to the income of other families in the community, however, a different pattern emerges. Both administrators and teachers are split equally between lower than most and about the same as most. On the other hand, parents and students are decidedly more optimistic. They feel that teachers are typically as well off as other families, if not more so. In sum, educators were reluctant to judge teachers as having high income, and parents were somewhat reluctant to judge teachers as having lower incomes.

Because of the significant difference between these two items about income, it is possible that educators compare the income of teachers with their expectations of what teachers are earning elsewhere in urban settings.



One implication of these findings is that prospective rural teachers whose a tions of "status" derive from income will not find that status in the rural community. Therefore, this factor should be considered as objectively as possible during recruitment, and could be determined easily by the university the student teacher attends, or by the interviewing school, by objective assessment.

Cultural Deprivation

One of the hypotheses was that rural students were culturally deprived, and that this might impose additional stress on the rural teacher. Several indices of cultural deprivation were studied: amount of television watching, amount of reading, number of vacations, amount of travel away from home. While deprivation may in fact exist in isolated instances, most rural students have more exposure in these areas than was suspected. The hypothesis of cultural deprivation does not seem acceptable for rural students in any significant number.

Liberal vs. Conservative Feelings

The response pattern toward the item "compare most of your feelings with those of most teachers" was consistently heterogeneous in all respondent groups. Parents do tend to see teachers as somewhat more liberal, while administrators and teachers are evenly split. The only intense feelings of any group were revealed by parents.

It does appear that there is a slight prejudice among members of the community about the "liberality" of teachers.

Why Teach in Rural Schools?

An attempt was made to isolate many of the reasons that rural educators chose to teach in a rural setting. The table below shows that



while there was some evasiveness in answering this question (indicated by the high number of responses in "other"), 35.5 percent of administrators and 27.6 percent of teachers report teaching in rural areas because it was the only available position at the time. It is also evident that while parents and students are largely naive in this regard, sizable numbers are aware of the reasons that cause teachers to come to their area to teach.

VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING BY
VARO17 WHY DO RURAL TEACHERS CHOOSE RURAL SCHOOLS

	<u>Key</u>	Var01	7								
<u>Var002</u>	Row Pct. Col. Pct.	Out- door Act.	Pay & Bene- fits	Social Life	Peace & Quiet	with	Only Avail. Posit.		Other	Unknown	Row Total
Adminis	strator	3.2 2.0	0.0	3.2	22.6 9.2	0.0	35.5 12.9	0.0	35.5 11.5	0.0	6.0
Teacher		11.8 18.4	0.0	0.0	18.4 18.4	3.9 33.3	27.6 24.7	0.0 0.0	27.6 21.9	10.5 7.0	14.8
Student	1	10.7	4.8 93.3	14.1 80.4	12.8 48.7	1.7 55.6	10.0 34.1	5.9 94.4	13.8 41.7	26.2 66.1	56.4
Parent		6.8	0.9	7.7 17.6	15.4 23.7	0.9 11.1	20.5 28.2	0.9	20.5 25.0	26.5 27.0	22.8
Colum Total	n	9.5	2.9	9.9	14.8	1.8	16.5	3.5	, 18.7	22.4.	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 90.21675 24 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0000 Contingency Coefficient = 0.38641



These findings were given additional substantiation by the selfreport of teachers and administrators as shown in the table below.

TABLE II

VAR059 WHY CHOOSE A RURAL POSITION?
(In Percent)

Value Label	Relative Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Adj. Freq.
Enjoy Rural Schools	2.7	14.0	14.0
Outdoor Activity	0.8	4.0	18.0
Pay & Benefits	0.2	1.0	19.0
Closer to People	1.7	9.0	28.0
Peace & Quiet	1.7	9.0	37.0
Available Position	4.0	21.0	58.0
Raise Family Safer	1.3	7.0	65.0
Uncomfortable in Urban	0.2	1.0	66.0
Other	6.5	34.0	100.0

Valid Observations - 100

There is a close correspondence between these percentages and the type of community rural teachers report being brought up in, as reported in the table below.

TABLE III

VAR057 TYPE OF COMMUNITY BROUGHT UP IN (In Percent)

Value Label	Rel. Freq.	Adj. Freq.	Cum. Adj. Freq.
Urban	2.9	14.4	14.4
Rural	14.8	74.0	88.5
Suburban	1.9	9.6	98.1
Other .	0.4	1.9	100.0
Rural Suburban	14.8 1.9	74.0 9.6	88.5 98.1



These findings, taken together, suggest that a significant percentage of rural teachers accepted their positions because they were the only available positions at the time, and that these teachers intend to relocate given an opportunity. Note the responses to the point-blank question, "If you now had the opportunity to relocate to an urban school, would you take it?" which is reproduced below.

TABLE IV

TAKE OPPORTUNITY TO RELOCATE IN URBAN SCHOOL

	(In Percent)					
Value Label	Relative Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Adj. Freq.			
Yes	5.4	29.8	29.8			

No 12.6 70.2 100.0

Valid Observations - 94

VAR061

Again the same percentage is evident as in other indices. It appears as though there are significant numbers of teachers who took rural positions because nothing else was available. These teachers are probably largely those who were brought up in urban environments, and who will return to an urban setting if and when an opportunity presents itself.

Since the teaching market is tightening up somewhat, it follows that applications should be screened for these variables, or that objective assessment should be used to determine these preferences before hiring.

The Most Difficult Adjustment for New Rural Teachers

The table reproduced on the next page shows that there isn't any "most difficult adjustment" for new rural teachers, and also shows that



parents and students tended to answer this item as a function of their own vested interest in the absence of an objective perception.

VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING BY
VARO20 DIFFICULT ADJUSTMENT FOR NEW RURAL TEACHER

	<u>Key</u>	<u>Var020</u>			_					
Var002	Row Pct. Col Pct.	Indi- vidual Instr.	Class- room Mgmt.	Social Accep- tance	Accept. in Comm.	Good Stu- dent Rel.	Cost of Liv.	Other	Unknown	Row Total
Adminis	strater	6.5 4.2	16.1 4.2	35.5 22.0	16.1 13.5	6.5	0.0	19.4 14.3	0.0	6.0
Teacher	• •	18.2 29.2	11.7 7.6	14.3 22.0	11.7 24.3	9.1 4.7	3.9 27.3	16.9 31.0	14.3 17.5	14.9
Student		7.9 47.9	31.7 77.3	6.2 36.0	5.2 40.5	34.5 67.6	1.7 45.5	3.1 21.4	9.7 44.4	56.0
Parent		7.5 18.8	10.8	8.3 20.0	6.7 21.6	32.5 26.4	2.5 27.3	11.7 .33.3	20.0 38.1	23.2
	lum tal	9.3	23.0	9.7	7.1	28.6	2.1	8.1	12.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 120.79254 21 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0 Contingency Coefficient = 0.43485

Since there is so much variation in what would be the "most difficut adjustment" some index of prospective individual difficulty could be determined in screening and by objective assessment.



A Satisfying Social Life for Teachers?

The first table reviewed shows that administrators tend to feel that rural teachers do not have a satisfying social life. The teachers, at first glance, seem split on this issue. But when sex and marital status are controlled for, single teachers, particularly female, report poor social opportunities.

TABLE VI

VAROO2 VARO21 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE FOR TEACHERS

	<u>Key</u>	<u>Var021</u>	•				
Var002	Row Pct. Col Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Admi	n istrat or	3.2 2.8	22.6 4.0	9.7 2.4	45.2 13.7	. 19.4 13.3	6.4
Teac	her	2.7 5.6	28.0 14.9	14.7	34.7 25.5	20.0	15.5
Stud	ent	9.6 72.2	43.8 67.2	30.5 66.4	9.9 26.5	6.3	56.1
Pare	nt	6.5 19.4	28.0	26.2 22.4	32.7 34.3	6.5 15.6	22.1
	Column Total	7.4	36.5	25.8	21.0	9.3	100.0

Chi Square = 77.37572

12 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.0000.

Contingency Coefficient = 0.37093



TABLE VII

VAROO5 SEX AND MARITAL STATUS BY
VARO21 SATISFYING SOCIAL LIFE FOR TEACHERS

	Key	<u>Var021</u>					
Var005	Row Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Sing	le Male	9.0 36.1	45.8 37.1	32.6 37.6	6.9 9.9	5.6 17.8	29.7
Sing	le Female	8.8 36.1	37.8 31.5	25.0 29.6	16.2 23.8	12.2 40.0	30.5
Marr	ried Male	2.3 5.6	34.9 16.9	15.1 10.4	37.2 31.7	10.5 20.0	17.7
Marr	ried Female	7.5 22.2	24.3 14.6	26.2 22.4	32.7 34.7	9.3 22.2	22.1
	Column Total	7.4	36.7	25.8	20.8	9.3	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 55.01476
12 degrees of freedom
Significance = 0.0000
Contingency Coefficient = 0.31918

The implication of these findings is that married teachers should be preferred to single teachers in the rural setting if the applicants are similar in ability and training.



Social Acceptance of Rural Teachers

A number of tables in the appendix center on various aspects of this question. The general finding is that the community is largely supportive of teachers, but that there are significant numbers (from 15 to 25 percent) who are not supportive of teachers. Further, most teachers report being accepted easily into the community; but again, there are significant numbers who do not. When reviewed on the basis of the above findings, it appears as though rural teachers who were brought up in urban settings, or who are single, will find social acceptance much more difficult. The difficulty on social acceptance, furthermore, will be largely a function of the teacher's personal inhibitions rather than reluctance on the part of the community. This is not to exclude the community from responsibility, but merely to indicate that married teachers who were brought up in rural or suburban settings seem to report much less difficulty than do single teachers brought up in urban areas.

Do Teachers Use Rural Positions Until Other Positions are Available?

The table on the following page shows that over half of the administrators and over half of the teachers report that this is often the case.

Over half of the students and over half of the parents are aware of this tendency.



VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY
VARO26 TEACHERS USE POSITION UNTIL OTHERS AVAILABLE

<u>Key</u>	<u>Var026</u>					
Row Pct. Var002 Col Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Administrator	21.9	28.1 6.0	12.5 2.9	28.1	9.4 7.7	6.2
Teacher	9.2 11.7	28.9 14.8	25.0 13.9	28.9 16.5	7.9 15.4	14.7
Student	8.3 40.0	29.0 56.4	31.4 66.4	23.1 50.4	8.3 61.5	56.0
Parent	18.3 36.7	28.3 22.8	19.2 16.8	29.2 26.3	5.0 15.4	23.2
Column Total	11.6	28.8	26.4	25.7	7.5	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 21.35913 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0454 Contingency Coefficient = 0.19900

The implication of these findings when taken with those above is that most administrators and teachers have identified the teachers who are dissatisfied with their positions. Being aware of this dissatisfaction (or possibly ambition), a certain amount of polarity would be expected to exist between rural teachers on the dimensions outlined above. This polarity would tend to enhance the likelihood of dissatisfied teachers leaving.



Minority Groups

Administrators, teachers, students, and parents are largely supportive of minority groups. The tables dealing with these issues (see in appendix) reveal consistently that the majority of all response groups support and accept members of minority groups. However, as mentioned above, there is also a small but sizable number from all groups who consistently do not support or accept minority students or teachers. Only two of the schools in the study have significant minority (Indian) students. The other eight schools would be found to have less than a five percent minority population if all minorities present were taken as a total group.

Do Rural Teachers Need Part-Time Work to Make a Living?

The following table shows that most administrators and teachers think that rural teachers must work part time to make a satisfactory living. In the 'strongly agree' column, teacher responses more than doubled those of the administrators. Interestingly enough, 25% of the administrators disagreed that teachers need part-time work. The parents disagreed most heartedly on the statement of part-time work with 56% disagreeing that teachers need part-time employment. Students also reported (51%) that they were in disagreement with teachers needing to work part-time.



VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY
VARO32 TEACHERS NEED PART-TIME WORK

Key	<u>Var032</u>					
Row Pct. Var002 Col Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Administrator	15.6 8.1	50.0 15.0	3.1	25.0 5.3	6.3 2.3	6.2
Teacher	36.4 45.2	37.7 27.1	. 13.0 8.9	11.7 5.9	1.3 1.2	14.8
Student	7.2 33.9	15.9 43.0	25.2 65.2	30.3 57.9	21.4 72.1	55.9
Parent	6.7 12.9	13.3 15.0	23.3 25.0	39.2 30.9	17.5 24.4	23.1
Column Total	11.9	20.6	21.6	29.3	16.6	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 116.53421 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0 Contingency Coefficient = 0.42821

But when administrators and teachers were asked how many <u>actually</u> do work part-time, as show in Table XII, 63% reported that they do not work. It may be, however, that many of the teachers are not able to locate part-time work in a small community. Also, a number of teachers may work during the summer in part-time employment.



TABLE XII

VAR062 HOURS PER WEEK WORK PART-TIME (In percent)

Value Label	Relative Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Adj. Freq.
Do Not Work	8.8	63.0	63.0
1 to 5 Hours	1.1	8.2	71.2
6 to 10 Hours	1.1	8.2	79.5
11 to 15 Hours	1.3	9.6	89.0
16 to 20 Hours	1.0	6.8	95.9
More than 20 Hours	0.6	4.1	100.0

Valid Observations - 73

Do Rural Teachers Expect Too Much from Their Students?

The following table shows that administrators are somewhat divided on this question. Teachers largely feel that they do not expect too much, from their students. A sizable proportion of students (38%) and parents (30%) tend to support the statement that teachers hold too high expectations of the students.



VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY VARO33 TEACHERS EXPECT TOO MUCH FROM STUDENTS

	<u>Key</u>	<u>Var033</u>					
Var002	Row Pct		Agree	Neutral	Pis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Admi	nistrato	r 0.0 0.0	31.3 8.4	6.3 3.0	43.8 7.2	18.8 8.2	6.2
Teac		0.0	9.1 5.9	10.4 12.1	58.4 23.2	22.1 23.3	14.9
Stud	ent .	19.0 84.6	29.3 71.4	15.5 68.2	24.8	11.4 45.2	56.1
Pare	nt .	8.5 15.4	14.4	9.3 16.7	53.4 32.5	14.4 23.3	22.8
	Column Total	12.6	23.0	12.8	37.5	14.1	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 80.32053 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0000 Contingency Coefficient = 0.36670

The implication of these findings is simply that most rural teachers do not expect too much from students while a significant minority does.

While the data does not specifically say so, it would be suspected that urban background correlates highly with overzealous expectations.



Do Rural Parents Expect Too Much From Teachers?

The table below shows that both administrators and teachers are significantly divided on this question. Note that both students and parents are also significantly split.

TABLE XIV

VAROO2 By VARO35 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING PARENTS EXPECT TOO MUCH FROM TEACHERS

	Key	Var035					
<u>Var002</u>	Row Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Adm i	nistrator	12.5 11.1	40.6 10.7	12.5 4.0	28.1 5.0	6.3 2.4	6.2
Teac	her	9.1 19.4	33.8 21.3	27.3 21.2	27.3 11.7	2.6 2.4	14.8
Stud	ent	4.8 38.9	17.9 42.6	20.0 58.6	35.9 58.1	21.4 74.7	55.9
Pare	ent	9.2 30.6	25.8 25.4	13.3 16.2	37.5 25.1	14.2 20.5	23.1
	Column Total	6.9	23.5	19.1	34.5	16.0	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 39.91649 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0001 Contingency Coefficient = 0.26724

The implication of these findings is simply that there are a significant number of parents who do expect too much from teachers. It would be unrealistic, however, to attribute this expectation to a rural environment.



Are Schools Too Strict?

Very few administrators, teachers, or parents think that rules and regulations in their schools are too strict. It is to be expected that students will tend to report too much restriction regardless of circumstance or location.

How Important is the Teaching Profession in the Community?

Perhaps one of the most interesting findings of the study is revealed in the table below. The table clearly shows that students and parents have a higher opinion of the importance of the teaching profession in the community than do teachers and administrators themselves.

VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY VARG18 IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING PROFESSION

	<u>Key</u>	<u>Var018</u>		Little	•	
Var002	Row Pct. Col Pct.	Very Im- portant	lmpor- tant	Impor- tance	Not Impor- tant	Row Total
	nistrator	25.0 3.5	62.5 8.8	12.5 · 6.8	0.0 0.0	6.2
Teac	her	24.7 8.3	51.9 17.7	19.5 25.4	3.9 50.0	14.8
Stud	lent	41.4° 52.6	46.6 59.7	11.0 54.2	1.0 50.0	55.9
Pare	ent	67.5 35.5	25.8 13.7	6.7 13.6	0.0	23.1
	Column Total	43.9	43.5	11.4	1.2	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 51.49911 9 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0000 Contingency Coefficient = 0.30045



It is possible that the teachers and administrators often become so involved with the day-to-day pursuit of their activities that they lose some perspective about the status attached to education by the community at large.

As indices of this value, it can be seen in the two tables below that very few parents will agree that home duties are on a par with educational activities. Further, parents are equally reluctant to discount the importance of extracurricular activities.

TABLE XVI

VAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY VARO37 HOME DUTIES MORE IMPORTANT THAN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

	<u>Key</u>	<u>Var037</u>					
<u>Var002</u>	Row Pct. Col Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Admi	nistrator	0.0	12.5 5.4	21.9 7.1	56.3 8.1	9.4 3.3	6.2
Teac	her	3.9 10.0	17.1 17.6	15.8 12:2	47.4 16.3	15.8 13.0	14.8
Stud	lent	8.7 83.3	16.7 64.9	21.3 62.2	34.1 44.3	19.2 59.8	55.7
Pare	ent	1.7	7.5 12.2	15.0 18.4	57.5 31.2	18.3 23.9	23.3
	Column Total	5.8	14.4	19.0	42.9	17.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 32.36581 12 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.0012 Contingency Coefficient = 0.24317



TABLE XVII

YAROO2 CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING BY YARO38 EXTRA ACTIVITIES NOT IMPORTANT FOR STUDENT

•	Key	<u>Var038</u>					
Var002	Row Pct. Col Pct.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Row Total
Ađmi	nistrator	0.0 0.0	6.3 7.1	3.1 2.9	40.6 - 6.2	50.0 7.0	6.2
Teac	cher ·	3.9 16.7	1.3 3.6	1.3 2.9	40.3 14.7	53.2 18.0	14.8
Stud		4.5 72.2	8.0 82.1	9.3 79.4	35.3 48.3	42.9 54.4	55.7 [°]
Pare	ent	1.7 11.1	1.7	, 4:1 14.7	53.7 30.8	38.8 20.6	23.3
	Column Total	3.5	5.4	6.6	40.7	43.9	100.0

Raw Chi Square = 30.31453'
12 degrees of freedom
Significance = 0.0025
Contingency Coefficient = 0.23492

The Handicapped Student in the Rural School

While a significant minority disagrees, the majority of administrators, teachers, and parents agree that rural schools are largely unprepared to deal with physical and mental handicaps.

Can Rural Students Compete Well with Urban Students?

The findings show that most administrators, teachers, students, and parents feel that rural students can compete well with their urban counterparts. In all response groups, however, a fairly significant minority



disagree. It would be difficult to establish the basis for this disagreement from the basis of this exploratory study.

Are Rural Teachers Adequately Trained?

There is a slight majority in all response groups which feels that rural teachers are adequately trained. There is, however, a very significant minority who disagree. It is felt that the adequacy of training was somewhat confused with the adequacy of performance of experienced rural teachers, and that if this item were worded to evaluate the training of only new rural teachers, there would be even more agreement that new rural teachers are inadequately trained.

In addition, it should be noted that administrators and teachers feel that as a rule the rural teacher must be considerably more flexible than does the urban teacher. This could account for a portion of the lack of adequate training cited above.

The Language Used by Rural Teachers

There was strong agreement among administrators and teachers that the language used by rural teachers in the classroom was significantly different from language used by students. It is not presently known whether this difference is cultural or developmental, or both.

Guidance and Counseling for Students and Parents

There is fair agreement among administrators, teachers, and parents that more guidance and counseling facilities are needed to serve rural parents and students. It should be noted from this response that parents would be very receptive of these additional facilities, which indicates that they would accept the guidance if available.



The Rural Teacher's Work Week

The consensus of rural administrators and teachers reports a work week of from 40 to 60 hours. The consensus of parents and students perceive the teacher as putting in significantly less time than he actually does, reporting a perceived work-week of from 30 to 50 hours. This finding takes on additional importance when it is considered that the community may feel that the teacher "does not work as hard or as long" as other members of the community.

Traditional or Innovative Teachers?

Table XVIII shows fairly uniform agreement among all response groups that rural schools need innovative teachers with new methods more than additional "traditional" teachers. It is not within the scope of this study to ascertain what each group would consider as desirable new methods. Modular scheduling, non-grading, and open classrooms may not be perceived as desirable as new methods that occur primarily within a classroom setting.

TABLE XVIII

CLASSIFY YOURSELF AS ONE OF FOLLOWING

BY NEED WHAT KIND OF TEACHERS

	<u>Key</u>	Var054		
AR00 <u>2</u>	Row Pct. Col Pct	Traditional	New Methods	Row Total
Adr	ministrator	14.3 3.3	85.7 6.3	5.6
Tead	cher	27.8 16.7	72.2 13.5	14.3
Stud	lent	24.0 57.5	76.0 57.0	57.1
Pare	ent	23.3 22.5	76.7 23.2	23.0
ТО	TAL	23.8	76.2	100.0



VARO02

VAR054

Raw Chi Square = 2.04672 3 degrees of freedom Significance = 0.5628 Contingency Coefficient - 0.06360

Some Additional Findings from Rural Teachers

It was of interest to note that 95.1% of rural teachers view ongoing inservice training as either very important or important. This
has critical implications for the direction taken by the Northeastern Utah
Service Center to provide specialist services to these areas.

Almost 84% of rural teachers were brought up in rural or suburban communities themselves. Of these, 77% were exclusively brought up in rural communities. On the other hand, 80.2% received their formal education training in urban communities. Only 16.8% report rural or suburban education training.

Preparations

These figures of actual preparations taught closely follow the figures for the number of preparations trained to teach. Over 68% of the teachers were trained to teach less than five preparations, and of those trained to teach more than five preparations, the majority are elementary school teachers.

These same figures hold for the number of preparations that the teacher received training to teach.

Only 27% of the teachers report that there are subjects they would prefer not to teach. Only 22% of the teachers feel strongly or very strongly that they would prefer not to teach these subjects.

Training for Potential Rural Teachers

There were three general classes of subjects which rural teachers report as being of benefit to potential rural teachers. These general



classifications and their respective contents are as follows:

1. Curriculum building

- a. behavior modification techniques
- b. disciplining
- c. counseling techniques
- d. innovative teaching techniques
- e. instructional media
- f. classes on child behavior
- g. youth leadership training
- h. administrative skills

2. Rural occupations

- a. rural psychology
- b. rural community affairs
- c. farm management
- d. rural vocations

3. Minority problems

It is of interest to note that these same subjects, in the same order, were requested as subjects for inservice training.

What Do Teachers Enjoy in Rural Areas?

The following five features of rural communities cover what most teachers enjoy about rural areas:

- 1. Parents are more cooperative.
- 2. The community is much more friendly.
- 3. The rural environment itself is pleasant:
 - a. peace and quiet
 - b. outdoor atmosphere
 - c. more recreational areas
 - d. clean air
 - e. easy way of life

4. Good environment for families:

- a. very little crime
- b. no social problems with minority groups
- c. closer social life
- d. closer church life



- 5. Better rapport with teachers and students:
 - a. instruction is more individual
 - b. more optimal teacher/student ratio
 - c. less discipline needed

What Do Teachers Dislike About Rural Areas?

- 1. The distance to cities for shopping and recreation.
- 2. Lack of cultural entertainment; lack of any entertainment.
- Lack of equipment, facilities, materials.
- 4. Limited curriculum.
- 5. Community cliques, increased gossip and small-town talk.
- 6. Attitudes of community are unprogressive or overly traditional.
- 7. Poor salary.

The tables that follow (Table IXX and Table XX) show the relative frequencies of reported enjoyment and displeasure from rural teachers about the above mentioned responses:

TABLE IXX

VAR070	ENJOY ABOUT	ENJOY ABOUT RURAL COMMUNITY		
Value Ľabel	Relative Frequency	Adjusted Frequency	Cumulative Adj. Freq.	
Knowing Parents	1.0	6.9	6.9	
Friendly Community	2.3	16.7	23.6	
Rural Environment	7.7	55.6	79.2	
Good Environment	0.8	5.6	84.7	
Rapport	1.1	8.3	93.1	
Ноте	0.2	1.4	94.4	
0ther	0.8	5.6	100.0	
No Responses	86.2	Missing	100.0	

Valid Observations - 72



TABLE XX

VAR073

DISLIKE ABOUT RURAL COMMUNITY

Value Label	Relative <u>Frequency</u>	Adjusted <u>Frequency</u>	Cumulative Adj. Freq.
Distance to City	3.6	30.2	30.2
Lack of Culture	2.5	20.6	50.8
Lacking Material	0.8	6.3	57.1
Community Cliques	2.7	22.2	79.4
Traditional Attitude	0.8	ô.3	85.7
Poor Salary	0.2	1.6	87.3
Social Life	1.0	7.9	95.2
Other	0.6	4.8	100.0
No Response	87.9	Missing	100.0

Valid Observations - 63

Is the Rural Teacher Under Closer Observation?

Over 56% of the rural teachers reported that they feel as though they are watched more closely than are teachers elsewhere. Over 43% do not feel this way.

Salary on a Nine Month Basis?

The teachers report that 86.7% would prefer their salary on a twelve month basis, in conformity with present practice, as opposed to the 13.3% who prefer a ninth month option.



SUMMARY

The following statements summarize the generally significant findings of this study:

- 1. Teachers and administrators are reluctant to judge teachers as having higher incomes, while parents are somewhat reluctant to judge the teachers as having lower incomes.
- 2. The hypothesis of cultural deprivation among rural students is unsubstantiated.
- 3. There is a slight prejudice in the rural communities to regard teachers as more "liberal" than the rest of the community.
- 4. A very significant number of administrators and teachers report that they teach in rural schools because it was the only available position at the time.
- 5. There is no "most difficult adjustment" for the new rural teacher. Rather, the most difficult adjustment can only be determined individually.
- 6. Married teachers who were brought up in rural communities have very satisfying social lives in the rural community. Single teachers and/or teachers raised in urban settings report difficulty in making a social adjustment to the rural community.
- 7. There is a marked tendency for rural teachers and administrators to use their position as a "springboard" to other more attractive positions.
- 8. All response groups are generally supportive and accepting of minority groups in the community.
- 9. The consensus of all response groups feels that innovative teachers are presently more needed than traditional teachers in the rural community. 36



- 10. While rural teachers report that most need to work part time to make a living, only 36% work part time at all.
- 11. A significant minority of teachers do expect too much from their students, but no more so than in urban schools.
- 12. There is general agreement that many parents expect too much from teachers. This is not felt to be bound within rural communities.
- 13. Very few administrators, teachers, or parents feel that rules and regulations at rural schools are too strict.
- 14. Teachers and administrators have a lower opinion of the importance of the teaching profession than do parents or students.
- 15. There is general agreement that the rural schools aren't adequately prepared to deal with physically and mentally handicapped students.
- 16. There is general agreement that rural students can compete well with their urban counterparts.
- 17. There is a general feeling that new rural teachers are not adequately trained.
- 18. The language used by rural teachers in the classroom is significantly different from the language used and understood by rural students.

 It is not known whether this difference is cultural or developmental or both.
- 19. There is fair universal agreement that more guidance and counseling facilities are needed to serve rural parents and students.
- 20. There is a significant difference in the reported length of the work-week of rural teachers and the perception of that work-week by the community at large. The implication is that teachers are not seen to work either as long or as hard as other members of the community.
- 21. The majority of teachers feel the on-going inservice training is either very important or important.



22. The majority of successful rural teachers were raised in rural communities. Most were trained, however, in urban communities.

The general implications of the study is that the turnover rate seems to be, in a large part, the result of teachers who accept positions in rural schools because these were the only positions available at the time. Most of these dissatisfied rural teachers tend to have been raised in urban areas, and are single.

The desire to improve one's position (the "springboard" hypothesis) is also a reason for teacher turnover. It is to be expected that single teachers may have more difficulty in realizing a satisfying social life with members of the opposite sex in a rural community. These teachers will often be dissatisfied not with the school system but with the limitations of social living. Married couples who choose rural living or single people who are aware of the disadvantages of social life in a rural community should be given primary attention by superintendents who are seeking new employees.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

By and large, the rural community is very supportive of the educational system generally and rural teachers specifically. Though this is generally true, there are a number of respondents who do not support the teachers and there are significant differences of opinion among many who are otherwise supportive. These conditions would probably be evident in urban centers also.

It would perhaps be unrealistic for teachers anywhere to be inundated by universal acceptance and support. If it is accepted that a certain amount of lack of support or lack of acceptance is part of virtually any vocation, then the implications from this study become quite clear.



First, attitudes of parents can be changed, or modified. It was noticed that very few of the rural schools have developed ongoing systematic public relations efforts. In this regard, a little effort in positive communication could go a long way, especially in attracting capable teachers to rural communities.

Second, the need to relate and communicate more with each other is equally true of teachers and administrators. More effort to enhance morale among teachers could alleviate much of the polarity and dissonance felt by many of the teachers.

Third, hiring practices need to be refined to screen for those prospective teachers who have characteristics which will obviously hinder their ability and social acceptance in a rural school and community.

Fourth, teacher training institutions need to work more closely with rural school districts in planning for their staffing needs. Teachers who have lived in rural settings tend to do better in rural schools. Universities may need to provide special rural experiences for prospective teachers or encourage prospective teachers with rural backgrounds to consider non-metropolitan teaching positions.

Lastly, inservice training programs need to be devised that render much more support both in enhancing instructional skill and creativity, and in generating higher cohesiveness and morale. Universities may need to spend more of their consultant time in assisting rural schools rather than expending energies in total urban concentration.



BIBLIOJRAPHY

- 1. Moe, Edward O. and Lewis R. Tamblyn. "Rural Schools As A Mechanism for Rural Development". National Educational Laboratory, Austin, Texas. 1974.
- 2. Heady, Earl O. "Making Rural Development Go: What Are the Elements?" Paper presented at National Public Policy Education Conference, Durham, New Hampshire, September 19-22, 1972.
- 3. Dawson, Howard. "Rural Education--A Backward and a Forward Look". Paper presented at National Conference on Rural Education, Washington, D. C. October 4, 1954.
- 4. Ford, Paul, et al. "Remote High Schools: The Realities". North-west Regional Educational Laboratory. April 1967.
- 5. Edgar, Charles B. "The Preparation of Teachers for Small Rural Schools". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1969.



APPENDIX



INTERPRETING FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS AND CROSS-TABULATIONS

Two types of data presentations are used in this report. The frequency distributions are simple summaries of the responses to the levels of a single variable. Each question in the Survey is a single variable, and each possible response to the question is a level of the variable. For example, the first frequency distribution in this report is on page 11. The variable label is "Why Choose a Rural Position?"

The left-most column, titled value label lists the possible responses to the variable label. The relative frequency column lists the percentage of occurrence of each value label including the entire sample. In the example of page 11, the responses in relative frequency came only from teachers and administrators. But since the frequency compared the entire sample, the relative frequency does not sum to 100 percent. Only about one-fifth of the respondents were teachers, so only about 20 percent of the relative frequency is listed.

Of more interest is the <u>adjusted frequency</u> which excludes those portions of the sample to which the question does not apply. This column does sum to 100 percent.

Note that when the entire sample responds to a question, the relative frequency and the adjusted frequency will be the same.

The <u>cumulative adjusted frequency</u> is merely the sum of the adjusted frequency percentages at each level. It sums to 100 percent just as does the adjusted frequency, and is listed merely as a convenience.

The second data presentations are cross-tabulations in which two variables (questions) are compared. The first cross-tabulation table is



shown on page 10. Note that two variables are listed, and that the levels of the first variable are listed vertically on the left, and that the levels of the second variable are listed horizontally at the top. The table then tabulates the occurrence of each level of one variable with each level of the other.

Each cell in the table contains two percentage figures. The key to these figures is shown at the upper left corner of the table. The first figure is always the <u>row</u> percentage, and the second figure is always the <u>column</u> percentage.

The cross-tabulation table permits three kinds of interpretation.

In the example on page 10, the first horizontal row compares the "administrator" with each of the ten possible responses of the second variable. The <u>row percentages</u> in each cell show what percentage of <u>administrators only</u> responded to the various levels of the second variable. Note that the row percentages will sum to 100 percent, because the figures apply only to that row level. The row total at the far right merely shows the <u>adjusted frequency</u> of the first variable just as it would appear in a frequency distribution, and is interpreted as explained above.

The second kind of interpretation is just the reverse of that just mentioned above. For example, the first vertical column in the table on page 10 tabulates "outdoor activities" of the second variable with each of the four levels of the first variable. The column percentages show what percentage of "outdoor activities" only corresponds with each level of the first variable. Note that the column percentages sum to 100 percent, because the column figures apply only to that column level. The column



total at the bottom merely shows the adjusted frequency of the second variable just as it would appear in a frequency distribution, and is interpreted as explained above.

The third kind of interpretation involves the figures given below the table. Each cell of the table has an expected value which would occur by chance with no relationship between the variables. In each cell of the table the actual value is compared with the expected value. The statistic which is used to evaluate the amount of deviation from expected value is the Chi-Square. The Chi-Square is computed by summing the deviations from expectation for each cell in the table. If this sum exceeds a specified value, then the table as a whole is said to be significant at a given level. This is to say that the two variables are interrelated in such a way that their relationship cannot be explained by chance. The smaller is the decimal fraction listed as the significance figure, the more deviant is the table from expectation --- and hence the greater is the interrelationship between the variables. In the table on page 10, for example, the significance figure is so small that the computer was unable to compute it. The implication is that the table is so significant that its conclusions (if made properly) could only be in error by less than one chance in 100,000.

By combining the level of significance with the distributions of percentages in the table, appropriate inferences can be made from the table with a confidence no less than that afforded by the level of significance.

As an added precaution, contingency coefficients are computed for each table. The contingency coefficient is a measure of strength of association between two va 'ables, and is similar to a correlation coefficient



(more appropriately a coefficient of determination). The contingency coefficient cannot exceed unity. A very small decimal fraction expressed as a contingency coefficient would generate suspicion about the validity of the table. A contingency coefficient below .1 would indicate that the table, though it could be highly significant, was spurious. In this case the inferences drawn from it would be very questionable even if highly significant.

All of the tables reported in this study are very significant, have sufficient contingency coefficients, and have a direct and significant bearing upon the purposes of the study.



NORTHEASTERN UTAH SERVICE CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE

1.	In which school are you filling out	this qu	estionnare?	
	 Union High School Roosevelt West Junior High School Duchesne Elementary School Vernal Junior High School Morgan Elementary School 	1 6,	<u> </u>	1001
2.	Please classify yourself as one of t	he foll	owing;	
	 Administrator Teacher Student Teacher's Aide and Parent 	6.	Teacher's Aide, not pare Parent Other	2 ent
3.	Circle the number of years you have of this school district:	been a	resident, student or empl	.oyee
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /	10 or m	ore/	3
4.	Please indicate your age:			
	1. 14 or under 2. 15 - 19 3. 20 - 24 4. 25 - 29 5. 30 - 34			4
5.	Please indicate your sex and marital	status	:	
	 single male single female married male married female 	5. 6. 7. 8.	divorced male divorced female widowed male widowed female	5
6.	What is your religious affiliation?			
	 Catholic Protestant Jewish 	4, 5.	Latter-day Saint Other	6
7.	Please place yourself in one of the	followi	ng groups:	
	1. Caucasian 2. American Indian 3. Oriental	4. 5.	Negro Spanish American	7



8.	Please indicate the last year of educa	tion you have finished:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			8
	1. 5th grade or less	5. 11th or 12th grade	
	2. 6th grade	6. Some college	
	3. 7th or 8th grade	7. College graduate	
	4. 9th or 10th grade	8. Graduate degree	
9.	Please indicate the occupation of the	hand of your family for yourse	1 <i>f</i> 4 <i>f</i>
۶,	you are the head of your family);	head of your ramily (or yourse	-1, 11
	,		9
	1. Professional	6. Business owner or manage	r
	2. Sales	7. Clerical	_
	3. Farmer or Rancher	8. Retired/disabled/unemplo	yed
	4. Educator	9. Student	
	5. Civil Service	10. All others	
10.		come to other families income	in
	this community?		10
	1. Higher than most		20
	2. About the same as most		
	3. Lower than most		
	4. Unknown		
11.	How would you compare a teacher's inco	me to the income of most famil	ies
	in this community?		
			11
	1. Higher than most		
	2. About the same as most		
٠	3. Lower than most 4. Unknown		
	T. CIRLOWA		
		1 1 1 1 1 1	
12.	About how many hours per week do you s	pend watching television;	12
	1. 5 or less	4. 16 to 20	
	2. 6 to 10	5. 21 or more	
	3. 11 to 15	6. Don't watch television	
13.	About how many magazines or books do y	ou read each month?	
			13
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /10	or more/	
14.	About how many times have you moved fr	om one community to another in	l
	the last five years?	•	
			14
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /10	or more/	



15.	Since you have lived in this over 100 miles from home?	district, how many times have you trav	eled
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8	9 /10 or more/	15
16.	How would you compare most of teachers?	your feelings with those of most	
	teachers,		16
	1. Much more liberal	•	
	 Somewhat more liberal About the same 	•	
	4. Somewhat more conservative	e	
	5. Much more conservative		
	6. Unknown		
17.	Why do most rural teachers ch	oose to teach in a rural school?	17
	1. They enjoy outdoor activi	ties.	1,
	2. The pay and benefits are	better.	
	3. They have a better social4. They enjoy the peace and		
	5. Their spouse was transfer		
	6. It was the only available		
	7. They felt unable to compe8. Other (Specify)	te with urban teachers.	
*	9. Unknown.		
18.	How important is the teaching	profession in your community?	
	1	2 of 14441e importance	18
•	 very important important 	 of little importance not important 	
19.	How many teachers in this sch	ool live in this community?	19
	1. all	4. few	13
	2. most	5. none	
	3. some	6. unknown	
20.	What do you think is the most teacher faces?	difficult adjustment the new rural	
			20
	1. Individualizing instructi	on	
	 Classroom management Limited social acceptance 		
	4. Acceptance into community	affairs	
	5. Making good teacher-stude	nt relations	
	6. Adjustment to the cost of7. Other (Specify)		
	8. Unknown		



					e statements much like those that follow. Please u agree or disagree as follows:	
	1. 2. 3.	ind	icat	es a	trong agreement 4. indicates disagreement greement 5. indicates strong disagree eutral	ement
21.	Tea act	cher ivit	s ha ies)	ve a in	very satisfying social life (outside of church this community.	21
	2.	(if	you	agr	ongly agree) 4. (if you disagree) ee) 5. (if you strongly disagree 't know)	21
=====	, 3 22 23 28	====	====	= = = =		2220850
ALL (BOVE	•			S THAT FOLLOW SHOULD BE ANSWERED IN THE SAME MANNER AS	ITEM
20021		aca 3	naee.	222		200002
22.	New	tea	cher	s ar	e <u>not</u> accepted easily into the community.	00
	1	2	3	4	5	22
23.		is v y wo		impo	rtant that teachers reside in the community in which	
٠	1	2	3	4	5	23
24.	Tea	cher	s sh	ou1d	be leaders in their community.	
	1	2	3	4	5	24
25.	Tea	cher	s in	this	s community are not active enough in community affairs	•
	1	2	3	4	5	25
26.					often use their positions to make a living until more tions are available.	
	1		3		5	26
	1	2	J	4	J	
27.	Tea	cher	s are	e to	o outspoken about sensitive political and social issue	s.



28.	Rura	al s	tude	nts.	irregardless of race, are members of a minority group.	
	1	2	3	4	•	28
00						
29.					rity groups receive too much attention politically and s community.	29
	1	2	3	4	5 -	23
30.		cher muni		e no	t active enough in the religious affairs of this	
	1	2	3	4	5	30
31.	The	LDS	Chu	rch	is too influential in this community.	
	1	2	3	4	5	31
32.			ache livi		ust work part-time in addition to teaching to make a	
	1	2	3	4	5	32
33.	Tea	cher	s of	ter.	expect too much from students and/or their parents.	,
	1	2	3	4	5	33
34.	Tea	cher	s in	thi	s community are too friendly with students.	
	1	2	3	4	5	34
35.	Par	ents	in	this	community often expect too much from teachers.	35
	1	2	3	4	5	33
36.	Ru1	es a	nd r	egu1	ations at this school are too strict.	36
	1	2	3	4	5	30
37.				dut hoo1	ies at home are more important than extra activities or	
	1	2	3	4	·	37



38.	Fartmo	224		es or study have no importance for a student's future,	
JO.	1 2		4		38
39.	Rural	. tead	hers	are often unprepared to teach minority students.	39
	1 2	2 3	4	5	
40.				are unprepared to deal with students who have physical	40
	1 2	2 3	4	5	•
41.				do not have the background or ability to compete ell with urban students.	41
	1 2	2 3	4	5	4.1
42.		ents : ker, (is school do not have enough field trips, films, guest	42
	1 2	2 3	4	5	
43.				in classes in this school should be changed to better of minority students.	43
	1	2 3	4	5	
44.		l tea ents.	chers	are not adequately trained to meet the needs of rural	44
	1	2 3	4	5	
45.	Rura	1 tea	chers	must be more flexible and versatile than urban teachers	45
	1	2 3	4	5	
46.		l tea hers.		must give more individual attention to students than urban	46
	1	2 3	4	5	
47.				sed by teachers is different than the English used by most ais school.	47
			. ,	E	• •



48.	Rura	al s	choo!	ls s	should	prepare	rural	students	for urban life.	48
	1	2	3	4	5					
49.					should eir sub		family	life ed	ucation and preparation fo	
	1	2	3	4	5					49
50.	Rura	al s	choo	ls s	should	teach s	tudents	how to	prepare for work in the c	ity.
	1	2	3	4	5		•			50
51.	Thi:			sho	ould ha	ave more	e guidan	ce and c	ounseling for students and	i
	1	2	3	4	5	,				51
==== 52.							think tool acti		age teacher in this school	spends
•	1. 2. 3.	31	hour to 4 to 5	0 h				4. 5. 6.	51 to 60 hours 61 or more hours unknown	52
53.	Who	sh	ould	be	respons	sible fo	or disci	plining	students in school?	53
	3.	Pr: Te:	rents incip acher rents	als s	d prin	cipals		5. 6. 7. 8.	Principals and teachers Parents, principals, and	
54.	Whi	.ch]	kind	of	teache	rs are n	more nee	eded in t	chis school?	54
	1. 2.				1 teacl	hers w method	. <i>د</i>			J ,



STUDE	ENTS ONLY:		
55.	How many hours per week do you spend e home?	ither at work or on chores at	
	1. 5 or less 2. 6 to 10 3. 11 to 15	4, 16 to 20 5. 21 or more 6, none	55
TEAC	HERS AND ADMINISTRATORS ONLY:		
56.	How important is continuing in-service	training for rural teachers?	56
	 very important important not very important not important 		
57.	What type of community did you grow up	in?	57
	 Urban Rural Suburban Other (specify) 		
58.	What type of community did you receive training in?	your professional education	
	 Urban Rural Suburban Other (specify) 		
59.	Why did you choose a rural position ra	ther than an urban position?	59
	 I really enjoy teaching in a rural I enjoy the outdoor activities for The pay and benefits are better. I feel much closer to people in a I enjoy the peace and quiet of a reference This was the only available position. This is a safer place to raise a reference I wouldn't feel comfortable teached Other (specify) 	myself and family. rural community. rural area. on at the time. amily.	3,



	would enjoy and/or be interested in:	60
	1.	
	2	
	3	
	4.	
	5	
1.	If you had an opportunity to relocate to an urban school for any reason, would you take it?	
	1 ves 2. no	61
	1. yes 2. no	
EAC	HERS ONLY:	
52.	About how many hours per week do you work part time?	 -
	\mathfrak{g}	62
	 Do not work part time. 1 to 5 hours 	
	3. 6 to 10 hours 4. 11 to 15 hours	
	5. 16 to 20 hours	
	6. More than 20 hours	
63.	How many different academic preparations do you teach this year?	
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /10 or more/	63
	/2 or 16.55/ 3 4 3 6 / 6 3 /16 61 2616/	
64.	How many different academic preparations were you trained to teach?	
	/2 or more/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /10 or more/	64
	/2 or more/ 3 4 3 6 / 6 3 / 25 62 mc-5,	
65.	Of the preparations you currently teach, how many would you prefer	
	not to teach?	65
	/2 or less/ 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 /10 or more/	
66.	If there are preparations you dislike teaching, how strongly do you	
	dislike teaching them?	66
	1. very strongly 3. not very strongly	4.00
	2. strongly 4. do not dislike any preparat	ior



1.	·····	
2.		
•	,	
Flease list things you	enjoy most about a rural community:	
		
3.		
_	you <u>dislike most</u> about a rural community:	
2.		
2.		
1		
1 2 3 As a rural teacher, do y		
1	you feel you are under closer observation than 2. no ing your salary on a nine-month basis rather	

